

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document submitted February 13, 2002.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statements filed February 13, 2002 and May 10, 2004.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the election without traverse of claims 1-14 and 19 in the Response to Restriction Requirement filed June 7, 2004.

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-14 and 19 are all the claims pending in the Application, as non-elected claims 15-18 are hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-14 and 19 have been rejected.

**Specification Objection**

The Examiner has objected to the Title for its brevity. The Title is hereby amended. Thus, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Drawings**

The Examiner has objected to the Drawings, alleging that FIG. 11 should be labeled "Prior Art." Applicant hereby submits a replacement FIG. 11 labeled "Prior Art."

**Indefiniteness Rejection**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 as allegedly being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The informalities noted by the Examiner have been corrected. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Anticipation Rejection**

The Examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sawada* (US 6,618,340; hereinafter “*Sawada*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully submits that *Sawada* is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as it was not published more than one year before the February 23, 2002 filing date of the instant Application. Nevertheless, since *Sawada* may be prior art under another provision of 35 U.S.C. § 102, Applicant addresses the merits of the current rejection below.

Although the Examiner alleges that *Sawada* discloses all of the features of independent claim 19, Applicant respectfully submits that *Sawada* fails to teach or suggest that “radially inner ends of the second disk support lugs are axially displaceable from a first storage position to a second holding position, wherein axially is defined as a direction parallel to an axis of rotation of the disks,” as recited therein.

Specifically, *Sawada* only discloses movable claw pieces 15a and 15b that move perpendicularly to an axis of rotation of a disk (see FIGS. 9 and 11).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 19 is patentable over the applied reference, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 and 19 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-14 and 19.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/073,419

Attorney Docket # Q68489

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen  
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 30, 2004